

I oppose loosening the rules designed to promote and protect diversity of media ownership. These rules were adopted to ensure that the public would receive a diverse range of viewpoints from the media, and not simply the opinions of a handful of media conglomerates.

In Portland, OR, where I live, I've already seen signs of reduced diversity when one channel buys up another. Recently one local television affiliate was bought out by another larger affiliate, and it significantly reduced our choices in local news, which hurts the ability of our community to hear multiple viewpoints. Since the majority of people in this country get their news from local television and radio, I believe this consolidation is detrimental. With fewer and larger companies controlling our media, they have far too much power over what we see and hear, and I believe they sacrifice their role as a community watchdog to commercial interests of the large corporation. Plus, these large companies are buying up multiple media outlets in a variety of forms, even further restricting diversity and information. ClearChannel is a clear example of this - they own local television, radio, and billboard media. They can cross-promote other ClearChannel shows and effectively black o!

ut information about other shows

, which seems to me to be monopolistic behavior. I STRONGLY oppose loosening the rules on media ownership and believe it will only hurt one of the principles this nation is founded on - free and diverse speech. As a citizen, I "own" the airwaves - that's what my taxes pay for - and I want a variety of opinions represented in the airwaves, not just those of a select few large companies.